conceive it does sufficiently appear, that this di-theistic doctritie of a good and evil god (or a good god and evil demon both self-existent), asserted by Plutarch and the Manicheans, was never so universally received amongst the Pagans as the same Plutarch pretendeth. Which thing may be yet further evidenced from hence, because the Mani-cbeans professed themselves not to have derived this opinion from the Pagans, nor to be a subdivision under them, or schism from them, but a quite different sect by themselves/ Thus, Faustus in St. Au£ustin: " Pagani bona et mala?

Contra Faust. i j- a x i. 1

lib.*o. c. 3. tetra et splendida, perpetua et caquca, TOhTpw.[m]* niutabilia et certa, corporalia et diviria, dS'[Bene] unum habere principium dogmatizant. His ego valde contraria censeo, qui bonis omnibus principium fateor Deum, contrariis vero Hylen (sic enim mali principium et naturam theologus uoster appellat.)" The Pagans dogmatize, that good and evil things, foul and splendid, perishing and perpetual, corporeal and Divine, do all alike proceed from the same principle. Whereas we think far otherwise, that God is the principle of all good, but Hyle (or the evil demon) of the contrary, which names our theologer (Manes) confounds together.—And afterwards Faustus there again determines, that there were indeed but two sects of religion in the world, really distinct from one another, viz. Paganism and [v]Manicheism.[a] From whence it may be concluded, that this doctrine of two active principles of good and evil, was not then looked upon as the generally-received doctrine of the Pagans. Wherefore, it seems reasonable to think, that Plutarch's imputing it so

[a] A pud Aug'ustiiJ. ubi supra/